India

FOR THE

No. 120. New Series.
No. 214. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, APRIL 20, 1900.

Registered as a Newspaper. | Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 185
The Two Reports... 188
A History of Politics 189
Notes from Bombay 190
The Famine in India:
5,149,000 on Relief 190
The Mansion House Fund 190
The *Investors' Review* Fund 190
In the Famine Districts... 190
Mr. Romesh Dutt on Over-Assessment... 191
Sir Lepel Griffin on Famine and Taxation 192
The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: The Minority Report... 192
Public Meetings on Indian Questions: The Work of the British Committee 195
Advertisements 196

NOTES AND NEWS.

THE Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure has not yet been issued, but there is reason to believe that the summary which the *Times* was, curiously enough, able to print last Tuesday week is accurate. We discuss the matter at some length on another page. Indians will hardly need to be reminded that whatever may be the value, direct and indirect, of the work of the Royal Commission, they owe it mainly to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. It was through his exertions that the Commission came to be appointed, and now for the first time his views as to the economic drain from India have found a place in an authoritative State document. For the first time the "Case for India" has had a hearing, and although the majority of the Commissioners do not appear to have dealt with it, it is now on record, and has obtained the approval of three members of the Commission who, to put it gently, are certainly not those that know least about India. It is evident, as Mr. Maclean's recent speech in the House of Commons showed, that the facts regarding the economic drain from India are coming to be more widely appreciated. As often happens in the case of Royal Commissions, it is the minority report which is chiefly valuable. This was to be anticipated. For if the general attitude of Englishmen towards Indian questions were such that the majority of a Royal Commission could be expected to produce the right kind of report, the appointment of a Commission would hardly have been necessary. Indians will no doubt make the best use of the minority report as a "jumping-off place."

The special correspondent of the *Times of India*, in the course of his investigations into the famine, has arrived at the small Native State of Morvi, which is situated on the Runn of Cutch. It has only 114,000 inhabitants and the soil is "far from fertile." But although "the terrible blight has fallen on it just as heavily as on any other portion of the Indian Empire, it is flourishing because it is governed by a chief whose pride is to secure the happiness and prosperity of the people." Now here it is to be feared that the correspondent who writes the above and the *Times of India* which publishes it are guilty, not indeed of sedition, but of displaying a critical spirit, which the most perfect government in the world—we mean that of the British in India—may well resent. For, in the first place, the State of Morvi is spoken of as flourishing by reason of its ruler's conduct, whereas all good subjects know that famine is a visitation of Providence which the best of governments cannot control. Then, in the next place, there is the suggestion that although Morvi has been as hardly hit as other parts of India, it has nevertheless continued to flourish; and this implies that the Government has been more successful than the Government of India in coping with the disaster. Thirdly, there is the terrible sug[illegible]tion that as Morvi flourishes because it is "the pride [illegible]ief to secure the happiness and prosperity of th[illegible]e," there may be some want of that pride where the State does not flourish. Finally, there seems to be a reprehensible oblivion of the inferiority of Native to British rule.

Apparently, however, the provision against famine is not solely due to the virtues of the present ruler, for we read of a grain pit eighty years old, and therefore made at a time when according to some authorities famine relief in Native States was unknown. The arrangements to cope with the present scarcity have, according to the correspondent of the *Times of India*, been especially excellent. Enquiries were begun early; purchases from outside the borders were made in good time; import duties on grain were remitted in order to encourage private enterprise; and well-digging was resorted to in order by irrigation to provide fodder for the cattle. The Chief visited every village. As a result of all this, only 4,000 plough bullocks have died out of 17,000. In other parts where the rainfall has been as deficient the proportion has been much greater.

There is one difficulty in relief which seems to have been met in Morvi more successfully than elsewhere. It is the relief of those whose pride will not allow them to go to the works or to ask for charity.

> They are the ones whose agonies are suffered in private, whose resolute despair is only visible to their nearest and dearest, whose awful want chance—the cry of the maniac from some upper room, or the solemn procession that bears a suicide forth—alone reveals.

Finding it impossible to discover and help these people privately, the Chief has now started a fund to be administered by the heads of the higher communities, to which those who thus suffer in silence belong.

Jeypore has not escaped the visitation of this terrible year, but yet its Mahárájá is able to offer 15 lakhs of rupees—one-fourth of the total revenue—as a gift to the British Government to form the nucleus of a permanent famine fund; and, with a characteristically Hindu touch, the Chief insists that the fund shall in no way be associated with his name. The gift has aroused very diverse feelings in the Indian press. The *Tribune* cannot help remembering how the former famine fund has been misappropriated, though it considers that the Mahárájá's gift will entail no hardship on so prosperous a state as Jeypore. The *Mahratta*, on the contrary, thinks, as no less than 60,000 persons are on the relief works in Jeypore, that such munificence, however noble, is singularly inopportune. It suggests, too, that the Government of India may become demoralised by thus relying on private charity, just as Lord Curzon believes that an able-bodied man becomes demoralised by receiving gratuitous relief. The *Hindu* enquires how it is that the Mahárájá, in time of famine, can afford to give, while the Government of India has to beg.

Mr. Dawkins referred in his Budget speech to the Famine Grant, which the public understood to be a contribution made in prosperous times as a provision for a season of adversity—a spreading of the cost of famine over many years. According to Mr. Dawkins:—

> The Famine Grant or the unappropriated balance thereof will in ordinary years when receipts exceed expenditure, be a surplus within a surplus. But the allocation of this first surplus in recent years has been obscured by the practice of charging against it expenditure on works which are not exclusively of a protective, *i.e.*, famine character.

This is a frank confession that money that has been raised from the taxpayer under the pretence of forming a Famine Fund, has been spent promiscuously on public works, some of which bore little relation to famine relief. In future this is not to be so. But all the same it is to be no nearer a true Famine Fund than before. It is to be used in years when there is no famine for the reduction or avoidance of debt. "Less debt would be incurred in normal

years, and the credit of the Government would be higher when it was compelled to borrow." Commenting on this, the *Pioneer* points out that the credit of India only depends to a small extent on the total amount of its debt. Its credit really depends on the confidence felt in its economic policy and its currency system. The *Pioneer* even says:—

> The utility of maintaining a misnamed Famine Grant to serve the purposes of a sort of spurious Sinking Fund is extremely dubious. The whole thing is apt to become a juggle with which the Government of India delude themselves and the public.

The present famine is admittedly worse than that of 1896-97, which in turn was worse than that of 1876-77; but there is too much reason to fear that the remissions of land-tax will be in inverse order. The Lyall Commission remarked that the amount remitted after the last famine was insignificant in comparison with what had been remitted after the famine of 1876. Now, according to the *Champion*, the February instalment has been collected with rigour in certain parts of the Bombay Presidency. Military and railway expenditure must go on, whether the rayat be ruined or not.

The *Pioneer* laughs at the *Times* and its talk about the "elasticity" of the Indian revenue. All the chief heads of taxation, as our Anglo-Indian contemporary points out, show little variation, except the land-tax and opium. The former exhibits a great decline. So that one branch of the revenue alone derived from taxation shows a considerable increase, and on the authority of the Director-General of Statistics, the opium revenue is "doomed to eventual extinction" however flourishing it may at present be. The supposed "elasticity" of revenue, whereby the budget balances with only a loan of 3 crores, is really due to an economy of expenditure—the cutting down of the sums spent on roads and buildings and the employment in South Africa of several thousand troops from India.

The first interpellation to which Lord Northcote had to listen at the first meeting of the Bombay Legislative Council over which he presided, related to the subject of over-assessment. Mr. Gokuldas Parekh asked about the relinquishment of land in Northern Gujerat in recent years. The comments of the *Times of India* are very instructive, and seem to show that even so determined a supporter of the over-population theory is beginning to have its doubts:—

> There can be no doubt that the contraction of cultivation in some areas has been serious enough to arouse misgivings among those interested in the prosperity of agriculture in Western India. At a time when prophetic statesmen are declaring that the chief danger ahead for India is a congested population, it is disconcerting occasionally to discover districts in which the cultivated area is actually diminishing.

Our contemporary sees that "there is a significance which will not escape the attention of critics of revenue administration" in Mr. Nugent's candid admission that "in some cases it is to be feared the pressure of the assessment on the poorer lands" has been a reason for relinquishment, even though district officials have been repeatedly enjoined to remedy the effects of over-assessment.

The *Hamburgischer Correspondent* of April 7th contained a striking article from its London representative on the debate on Sir William Wedderburn's motion (April 3). The writer presents a skilful summary of the facts relative to the famine, and treats the discussion in the light of them. He regards the division as "this time a moral victory" for Sir William Wedderburn, whose quiet persistence "year after year in the teeth of derisive attacks" he describes with admiration. He notes also the effect on the House, and even on Lord George Hamilton; and "papers like the *Times*," he says, "which formerly had only remarks of disapproval for the gallant champion of a good cause, to-day change their tone in a very noteworthy fashion." His painful summary of famine facts may give the Germans a handle for triumph over the comparative failure of British administrative methods; but it is conspicuously accurate, nevertheless. What the Germans may think of the Secretary of State for thwarting the obvious willingness of the House to grant Imperial aid in sympathy may be left to the imagination.

Lord Curzon, in closing the debate in the Legislative Council on the Financial Statement, cited certain statistics regarding the famine. One set of these figures comprised estimates of the actual money loss of crops that failed. Perhaps no two or three of these which came through by telegraph will give to business men a more practical conception of "the consequences of this visitation of Nature on so gigantic and ruinous a scale" than they are likely to realise from the round figures of areas affected or numbers of people on relief works. Let us set out these figures of Nature's deficit so far as the meagre notes at present before us will serve:—

Wheat crop	8 to £10,000,000
Cotton „	7,000,000
Oil seeds, say	5,000,000
Food crops, "loss to cultivators in Bombay Presidency alone"	15,000,000
Total rough estimate ..	£37,000,000

It is mentioned that the Bombay cultivators lose on their cotton crop four millions, but these are probably included in the seven as above. Now, how can this gigantic deficiency be met? Lord Curzon remarked, in passing, that towards that deficit his Government will have to spend or sacrifice £8,500,000—apart from advances to rayats or landholders and loans to the Native Indian States; the losses on crops therein, be it noted, are not included in the millions above, which relate to British territory.

If business men or other readers raise questions as to the accuracy of Lord Curzon's figures, they may rest assured—on grounds that cannot be set out in this brief note—that these are inside estimates and well within the remark. They pertain to one large branch of those systematically collected statistics that are amongst the results of that "wonderful administrative machinery" which the Viceroy not unjustly extolled. No doubt there are in Indian statistics of production and cost many discrepancies in detail, but the totals cited for the present purpose may, as we have said, be taken as only too real. Another point: we have accepted for this purpose the financial delusive symbol £; but whatever discount that may require as representing rupees to the rayats on the spot, it must be remembered that the total will be far short of the export valuation at the port of shipment. So that the thirty-seven millions of deficiency in the provinces may be said to represent for India as a whole quite fifty millions in the national balance-sheet of the following year.

Thus there is one pressing and practical consideration that this incidental survey by the Viceroy forces on public attention. What further witness do our responsible public men need to convince them that no time should be lost in deciding to make a substantial grant of five or six millions from the British Treasury? This would be, as has been well said, a "national" contribution in aid of our great but impoverished Eastern dependency, for whose welfare the United Kingdom has made itself responsible.

It is pleasant to note American sympathy with the famine-stricken Indians. The *Christian Herald*, as we noted last week, raised a fund, which was invested in food-stuffs; and the American Government is said to have chartered a steamer to convey the food to India. If the method of transfer be not the promptest conceivable, still it gives the Government its only obvious opportunity of taking part in the act of benevolence; and no doubt the steamer will arrive before the famine is over. The kindliness of the Americans will meet with a response of lively gratitude—here as well as in India.

It is strange that popular blunders possess such vitality in the mouths of people that ought to know better. Speaking at a Famine Relief meeting in Manchester (April 8), Sir Frank Forbes Adam incidentally said:—

> Though they (the Indians) were a hard-working race, the peasants were led by their ancient prejudices to squander the money they received upon ceremonies connected with death, marriage, or religion, and thus they rapidly fell into the hands of the Native money-lenders.

This ancient misconception, one might have thought, was disposed of once for all by the Report of the Deccan Riots Commission (p. 19, para. 54):—

> The results of the Commission's [illegible] show that undue prominence has been given to the expenditu[illegible] on marriage and other festivals as a cause of the rayat's indebtedness. The expenditure on

such occasions may [torn] ...travagant when compared with the rayat[torn] occasions occur seldom, and probably in a course of y[torn] ...tal sum spent in this way by any rayat is not larger than a m[torn] in his position is justified in spending on social and domestic pleasures.

But we are not sanguine enough to imagine that we have even yet heard the last of this wretched calumny on a people that were described by Sir David Barbour in his evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure (and by many another competent observer) as "most frugal and economical."

The fact is that the extravagance is practised—and practised glaringly—elsewhere, and at the poor rayat's expense too. Mr. Romesh C. Dutt wrote in the August number of the *Fortnightly Review*, 1897 :—

The reason is not a want of frugality, or of sobriety, or of prudence. The Indian peasant is the most sober, the most frugal, and the most prudent peasant on the face of the earth. The reason is that at each settlement the rent payable by him is increased and his capacity to save decreased. The reason is that with no savings of his own he goes to the money-lender under every pressure, and our Civil Courts with their hard and fast rules only cast him deeper into the meshes of the grasping money-lender. The reason is that in every petty dispute, civil and criminal, he is compelled to have recourse to distant and expensive law courts. The reason is that he has to pay many taxes in order to maintain England's Empire in Asia.

We commend these passages to Sir Frank Forbes Adam, and to other speakers on the qualities of the Indian peasant, against their next appearance on a public platform.

Again, there is Sir Lepel Griffin, in a letter to the *Times* (April 11), writing wildly about "the too abundant population" :—

Plague and famine are no more than the automatic efforts of Nature to repulse and repress the too abundant population which over-civilisation has called into being. The extension of irrigation and cultivation, the enforcement of sanitation and vaccination, the prohibition of widow-burning and female infanticide, the cessation of war and rapine have reduced Indian mortality by one-half in fifty years, and the vast population increases more quickly than the increase of food-supply in newly-irrigated areas or the food-distributing powers of our railways. Are we fighting a hopeless battle?

Now it is not a valid inference that plague and famine are natural efforts to repress the populations: they do not in fact operate in the densest areas of the Indian population. Of course, our reforms have diminished the death-rate, though nothing like 50 per cent., as Mr. Digby shows in the *Times* (April 17) in reply to Sir Lepel; but "the food-distributing powers of our railways" are quite adequate to the needs of the population—there has not been a single complaint on that score. And as to the fallacy of over-population, we are sick and tired of exposing it; another *Times* correspondent (April 17) has once more demolished it.

There is useful matter, however, in other parts of Sir Lepel's letter. For instance, this :—

I cannot but fear that public charity, so urgently required, may be checked by the too optimistic character of the Indian Budget as telegraphed to the *Times*, and by the speech, last week, of Lord George Hamilton in the debate on the famine.

It could not be otherwise. So Sir Lepel sets himself to correct the official optimism, and to remove the probable impression of the public "that no special efforts on their part are necessary." He points out that the Indian revenue includes the so-called Famine Fund of Rs. 15,000,000, and "a further sum of about Rs. 35,000,000 which was imposed in 1894-95 to meet the loss to the Government on its Home Charges by the fall in exchange below 1s. 4d." But for two years past the exchange has been steady at about 1s. 4d., and yet these special taxes remain because of the famine expenditure. Sir Lepel proceeds :—

It will thus be seen that the people of India have been paying for the last two years no less than Rs. 50,000,000 per annum, or an equivalent in sterling of £6,000,000 for the two years, as special famine taxation, over and above the normal revenue of India. When this important fact is realised, and the consequent special burden resting on the people of India, the Indian revenue returns will appear less roseate and the need for English charity and generosity more urgent.

The argument is perfectly just. Sir Lepel might even have raised his six millions by three-quarters of a million sterling.

We have special pleasure in recording the practical interest taken in the famine-stricken Indians by the Rev. Lord Scarsdale, the father of Lord Curzon. Lord Scarsdale has intimated his intention of throwing open Kedleston Hall, the family mansion—the model on which Government House in Calcutta was designed—to public inspection at a small charge, and to devote the proceeds to the Famine Fund. The special appeal is to the people of Derby and Derbyshire, but no doubt the public will be attracted from a much wider area.

It is lamentable, after all the experience we have had of plague regulations, that a riot should have broken out in Cawnpore, during which the troops fired into the crowd—with what results we are not informed, just as if it were perfectly immaterial. There had been sporadic cases of plague, but these had been dealt with, and the regulations appear to have been directed to "preventing plague entering into Cawnpore." Sir Antony MacDonnell met the leading unofficial members of the Native community. The special correspondent of the *Pioneer* (as reported by the Simla correspondent of the *Times*) says :—

The deputation stated the objections of the people, which were chiefly aimed at the clause in the regulations directing the removal of patients to the segregation camps. Sir Antony MacDonnell said that as far as possible the people would be treated in their own houses, but the removal of the objectionable clause would mean practically to withdraw the plague regulations, or at any rate to render them futile.

The Lieutenant-Governor was conciliatory, and issued an explanatory proclamation, promising to consider any representations addressed to him through the headmen. The example of other places shows that there need have been no trouble whatever at Cawnpore if the officials had learnt a lesson that has been well inculcated.

General Sir William Gatacre has been "ordered to England." The *Daily News*, in commenting on the fact, said :—

General Gatacre has in past campaigns done excellent service to his Queen and country, and has received the thanks of Parliament. He went to Egypt with a high reputation, which he had gained by distinguished service in Burma and Chitral, and this reputation was enhanced in the Sudan campaign. As a man, said Mr. Steevens, he radiates a gentle tender courtesy. As a General, he is famous for his tireless, abounding, superhuman energy. If he worked his men hard, he never spared himself; and, hence, though they called him in the ranks "General Back-acher," the men trusted him and named him also "the soldier's general."

Is this, then, the reward of further "excellent service" done by "the soldier's general?" The *Daily News* regards his supersession as "disciplinary"; but the idea of discipline of this sort for our generals in the field is sufficiently odd to be unintelligible. The Stormberg and Reddersburg disasters were most unfortunate; but so far as we know the facts they do not account for General Gatacre's supersession. We must suspend judgment till further information is vouchsafed. It may be that the General's health has given way. He had certainly the most trying district to operate in, and he was very considerably hampered. Besides, there are local matters of a relevant character which the conditions of press censorship do not allow to reach England. On the merits, at any rate, there seem to be several other generals that should have come by an earlier ship than General Gatacre. There will be much sympathy with him in Bombay, where he managed the plague so admirably.

A Cambridge correspondent writes :—Like everybody else I was astonished to read in your last issue about the racial distinction made between Indians and Englishmen as regards admission to the Royal Indian Engineering College, Cooper's Hill. A reason for the alteration has suggested itself to me, although I must admit that it is not quite complimentary to the fair spirit of Englishmen. The course in the Engineering College lasts for three years and College examination's are held at the end of every term, the marks in each examination being added up to settle the final places of the candidates. In the examinations held in December last the students that headed the first and third year lists were both Indians. As the new regulations were published in February, is the general public right in reading in this coincidence the fear that the authorities feel that Indians are too hard nuts to crack in a fair competition? Three years ago an Indian headed the I.C.S. list. If one or two more Indians do the same, is the I.C.S. also to be closed to Indians? Formerly restrictions were placed in the way of Indians because, with or without restrictions, it was said, they can't hope to succeed against the superior brain of the Anglo-Saxon. Now their proved ability bids fair to be their ruin.

THE TWO REPORTS.

THE Report of the Royal Commission on the Civil and Military Expenditure of India, though formally laid on the Table of the House, is not yet available to the public, and we must gather the tenor of its contents from the summary furnished by the *Times* (April 10). Judging from that, one can hardly congratulate the Commission on the results of their five years' labour. They appear to have applied the most technical restriction to the scope of the reference, examining only the mechanical working of the machinery by which civil and military expenditure incurred in India is administered and managed, and limiting the question of apportionment of charge between the Imperial and Indian Governments chiefly to an adjustment of certain disputes on accounts between the War Office and the Admiralty on the one hand and the India Office on the other. The Minority Report, which is signed by Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. W. S. Caine, and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, takes a wider view. The signatories interpret the reference in the light of the statement made by Sir (then Mr.) Henry Fowler, Secretary of State for India, in the House of Commons on August 15, 1894, that the practical test was "whether the Government of India, with all its machinery as then existing in India, had or had not promoted the general prosperity of the people in its charge, and whether India was better or worse off by being a province of the British Crown." The difference between the two positions is the difference between form and substance. The Majority Report deals mainly with wrappages and fringes; the Minority Report strikes to the pith and marrow. There could be no stronger testimony to the value of the latter than the comment of the *Times* (April 10): "it is not at all necessary for practical politicians to concern themselves" with it.

The Majority Report states—and nobody doubts it—that the financial machinery is well organised, and that its action is effectively controlled. The Commissioners suggest that the financial year should be made to coincide with the Calendar year, so as to obviate the need of the Revised Budget and to allow earlier discussion at home. This would undoubtedly be a distinct improvement, but it is only suggested. On the question of the practical power of the Finance Minister, the disproportionate military weight in the Governor-General's Council fell to be considered; but the Commissioners got rid of the difficulty by finding that it did not lie within their reference. With regard to audit, they propose an assimilation of the office of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India to the office of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of the United Kingdom, and a like assimilation of procedure. Here is another advance, though everything will depend on the working of the system. But it cannot in any case pretend to the efficiency of the system recommended in the Minority Report—an enquiry and report by a Select Committee of the House on a full array of materials compiled under improved conditions. Such materials would include the Budget debates in the Governor-General's Legislative Council, with dissents, if any; a despatch from the Governor-General, including a special report by the Finance Minister on the financial position; and a financial statement by the Secretary of State in Council, with dissents, if any. At the same time the Indian taxpayer should have a voice in the case. To this end the non-official members of the Governor-General's Council "should (1) be made more directly representative of the Indian people, and (2) should have the right to move amendments and divide the Council upon the provisions of the Budget, while (3) a sufficient number of representative Indians of position and experience should be nominated to the Council of the Secretary of State on the recommendation of the elected members of the Viceroy's and Local Legislative Councils." Further, it is suggested that there should be at least one Indian in the Executive Council of the Governor-General; that the control of the House of Commons should be rendered effective by the placing of the salary of the Secretary of State for India upon the British estimates; that the old practice of a Parliamentary enquiry every twenty years should be revived by statute; and that the frontiers of India should be defined by Parliament and not altered without the authority of Parliament. It is not surprising that the *Times* should attempt to kill such vital p... ...sels of contemptuous neglect.

The Commissioners find that the Indian Debt has been largely reduced. It is still capable, however, of very large reduction. It is a veritable millstone on the neck of the country. How it is to be reduced does not appear. The debt resulting from the Mutiny is stated at Rx. 45,000,000, and in thirty-five years from April 30, 1862—that is down to 1897—only Rx. 23,000,000 (or just over one-half) had been paid, so that it would take another generation to clear it off at the past rate of progress. We find no reference to John Bright's opinion (which the *Times* would find in its issue of March 8, 1859) that "if every man had what is just, no doubt that £40,000,000 (or, as the Commissioners put it, Rx. 45,000,000) would have to be paid out of the taxes levied upon the people of this country." Nor does there seem to be any effective handling of the expenditure on defence and foreign affairs; the Commissioners appear to be content to "note that the increase in the non-effective charge is formidable," and to recommend that an actuarial report be obtained on various points. The Minority Report, on the other hand, while not discussing trans-frontier expeditions, or the larger question of the policy of "greater military preparedness," points out "that a return to the policy of Lord Lawrence and Lord Ripon would remove the cause for increased military expenditure and justify a return to the scale of expenditure considered safe and sufficient by the Simla Army Commission." The minority also point out that railway development is responsible for a heavy share of India's gold liabilities; while the majority have nothing better to suggest on this head than that the loss on purely military lines should be transferred to the head of military expenditure, in the hope that then the purely commercial lines would pay their way—a process that in no way relieves the taxpayer, but offers a fresh point on which the Government might be able to boast of success. The internal administration, the majority conclude, is not excessively costly as compared with twenty years ago (1895 compared with 1875). Law and justice are practically self-supporting. Education in 1895 took only Rx. 1,500,000 out of the public funds—not "a lavish or excessive grant for the education of 230,000,000 people"! And generally, so far as cost of general administration goes, "the Government of India cannot fairly be charged with extravagance"! Nay, "even the Indian scale of furlough or leave is not extravagant when compared with allowances of the same kind in the Imperial diplomatic and consular service in Ceylon"—as if, to be sure, that were a just basis of comparison. As to pension, they want actuarial calculations, but it is not necessary to follow the details, for "while the Commissioners consider it their duty to call attention to this and other points, they express no opinion adverse to the present scale, and declare that no revision of the pension regulations would be justifiable except after a full review of the financial working of the general regulations and proof that the burden cast by them on the taxpayer exceeds the necessities of the case." Needless to say, the minority deal incisively with these pensions and with "the necessities of the case." They insist upon the true cure for the financial malady so far as it is due to the internal administration—namely, the wider employment of Native agency in accordance with the Act of 1833 and the Proclamation. They also recommend a new form of agreement for European servants: pay all salaries in India at the market price, and give the Europeans an additional "personal yearly allowance which should be the compensation for exile in a tropical country." They also propose a further extension of local self-government, with the hint "that the economies contemplated might be effected by administering our collectorates more on the model of a well-ordered Native State, such as Mysore or Gondal." The thoroughness of these proposals puts to shame the peddling and timid suggestions of the majority.

"The real kernel of the Report," as the *Times* itself sees, is the treatment of the apportionment of charges. On this head we must for the moment be content to separate two or three outstanding points from the masses of detail. The majority suggest £50,000 a year as a grant towards the yearly charge of the India Office. This follows the analogy of the Colonial Office, and is good as far as it goes, though the Colonial analogy suggests a great deal besides. The majority also recommend an

equal division of the charges of maintaining Aden, the Persian Legation, and the Persian Consulate. So far, good. They allow their discussion of the Army Charges to lose itself in the controversy about short service; but they think "the Reserve must be regarded as a Reserve both for the United Kingdom and for India;" from which, one would suppose, it follows that the cost should be divided. Something is also gained by the formulation of the cases where India has or has not (1) "a direct and substantial interest," or (2) "a modified interest," or (3) "sole interest," in the employment of Indian forces outside India; and the majority suggest an arbitration board to decide cases where the Governments differ upon the question of "distinct and special interest," the decision of the board to be finally passed upon by the two Houses of Parliament. The majority also hold that India's contribution in respect of the Navy "is not excessive;" and they partly accept and partly reject the points of Indian appeal for liberal treatment, concluding that on the whole the existing system is practically not unfair. "The Imperial and the Indian Governments," says the *Times* complacently, "are left to strike a bargain on strict commercial principles;" as if the parties stood on equal terms in the contract.

The minority, on the other hand, take a firm grasp of the substantial elements of the problem. They recommend as a working arrangement that Britain should pay for all British employed upon Indian work in Britain; that India should pay for all Indians employed in India; and for all others in equal shares; or, going to the extreme of moderation, they would divide equally the cost of all European agency on behalf of India. All trans-frontier wars since 1858, they hold, should be wholly paid for primarily out of the British Exchequer, India contributing in proportion to the benefit accruing to her from the protection of her frontier or other circumstances arising out of the war. For distant wars India should pay nothing whatever, except, perhaps, in case the Suez Canal were actually threatened and had to be actually defended. The British garrison, they contend, should be reduced by 20,000; not by withdrawal, but by transference of their charges (as a British reserve) to the British Exchequer. They would divide the capitation grant and the cost of the Navy; and they suggest that the Arbitration Tribunal should be the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Evidently India has scored heavily, notwithstanding the wide variance of the two Reports. We have pointed out considerable concessions made by the majority; but still more important is it to have the whole argument on both sides submitted to Parliament and to the public. The minority deserve most cordial congratulations on the results of their prolonged and arduous labours.

A HISTORY OF POLITICS.[1]

IT is not necessary to commit oneself to Mr. Jenks's paradox of "the greater the subject, the smaller the space in which it can be treated," in order to assert strongly the usefulness of such a small and compact introduction as he has provided to the history of political institutions. It has been customary for English students to approach this subject by reading as their first book Sir Henry Maine's epoch-making work on "Ancient Law," just as all students of Political Economy used at one time to begin by reading Adam Smith on "The Wealth of Nations." The first reading of such a book may well make an epoch in the life of an individual reader, long after the subject has passed the stage to which it was brought by the book itself; and this is a service of such priceless value that it is doubtful whether any other advantages can quite compensate for the loss that is involved in entering the subject by any other door. Yet if the student is not to learn much which he will have to unlearn somewhat painfully later on, he ought to be provided from the first with a handbook that will put before him clearly and succinctly the results obtained by more recent investigators, the points in which the theories of the great pioneers of the science have been confirmed or modified or disproved, the points that are still open to doubt, the new questions and difficulties that have been raised. It would be difficult to imagine a book better fitted for this purpose than Mr. Jenks's primer. He has made, one is glad to see, no affectation of writing it in words of one syllable for the youthful mind. In the legitimate boast of the publisher's prospectus it is "adapted to the needs of the general public, whilst forming an introduction to the special studies of scholars and students."

One advantage that this little book possesses over all its predecessors is that instead of beginning with the patriarchal type of society, it attempts to give, and really succeeds in giving, a clear and useful account of the earlier savage type. Limited as his space is, Mr. Jenks's account is far fuller than that of Mr. Walter Bagehot in "Physics and Politics," though the latter fully recognised the truth about savage society and poured pleasant ridicule upon Dryden's conception of a time when "wild in woods the noble savage ran." Mr. Jenks has made good use of the valuable work of Messrs. Spencer and Gillen on "The Native Tribes of Australia," published last year.

For the gulf between the savage and the patriarchal state Mr. Jenks provides an ingenious bridge of two arches. His view is that "the domestication of animals converted the savage pack into the patriarchal tribe," and that afterwards "the adoption of agriculture broke up the tribe into clans." For the first step he draws us a humorous picture of "the lazy and overfed savage, who amused himself by taming and petting his superfluous captive animals," and thus unconsciously began a revolution in the world's history. As to the second step, he insists strongly that earlier observers were mistaken in looking upon the tribe as a development of the clan. The tribe is the oldest unit; as this breaks up, clans are formed; and as the clan breaks up, it leaves as independent units the households comprised within it.

Dealing with the village community, Mr. Jenks, who is not a mere populariser of other people's ideas but an investigator whose own theories are entitled to respectful consideration, attempts to reconcile the two opposing views that the village has its origin in "kinship" and in "lordship." Looking upon the community as primarily a body of kinsmen, he recognises the important part played from the first by the subject stranger in the clan and also the fact that "wherever we find primitive agricultural society we always find something in the nature of dues or rents paid by the farmer." His conclusion is that "kinship" and "lordship" are both very early and very powerful principles of association.

Next we have a clear account of the effect of industry and trade guilds on early society, and of the service that feudalism performed in mediæval Europe in paving the way for the modern State. It is pointed out that while feudalism in some ways resembled the old patriarchal organisation, a new principle was introduced: "The rights of the individual were no longer acquired by birthright, by membership of a social group, but were at least deemed to be the grant of a superior, in return for promised service."

We have not space to follow Mr. Jenks into his description of the rise of the modern State—certainly not the least interesting or valuable part of his book. He applies the historical method dispassionately to the examination of the connexion between the State and property, justice and legislation. The very intricate story of the development of the modern idea of property is set forth with admirable lucidity. The concluding chapter on "Varieties of Political Society" differs in two respects from the treatment of the subject in the ordinary manuals; first, in its fuller recognition of the importance of "federations"; secondly, in its useful distinction between "common law" and "prerogative" States, between States where officials are subject to the ordinary law and States where officials are protected from the ordinary courts. This is the vital distinction between the English-speaking communities and the other States of the civilised world. If Englishmen are to keep it, they must understand and value it aright.

Messrs. Dent are to be congratulated on having secured such a fresh and stimulating piece of work for their new series of primers. Like one or two of the best of Messrs. Macmillan's earlier series—Mr. Dowden's "Shakespeare" or Mr. Stopford Brooke's "English Literature"—it contains far more intellectual nutriment than the vast majority of more pretentious volumes.

[1] "A History of Politics." By Edward Jenks, M.A., Reader in Law to the University of Oxford. (The Temple Primers). London: J. M. Dent and Co.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

THE DEBATE ON THE BUDGET.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, March 31.

The Budget has been published, and has already been discussed in and out of the Council. Some of the official organs are jubilant over it and even go the length of calling it a "brilliant" production. This roseate opinion, however, is not generally observable in the Press. Too much is made of the change in nomenclature, about which I have already written. But it is now widely held that the Financial Statement is devoid of any special merit and may be easily forgotten. The surplus of twenty-four lakhs also has been pronounced to be optimistic. The Hon. Mr. Pherozeshah M. Mehta characterised it as such in the Council, remarking that if the surplus were realised the benefit of it should go entirely to the assistance of the Bombay Presidency which above all others has suffered from the prevailing famine. The debate shows that all the popular representatives were unanimous on the subject of an enquiry into the causes of famine. Mr. Mehta struck the keynote, but it seems from the speech of the Viceroy that this part of the subject was not responded to. The Mahárájá of Darbhanga wished a specific Commission for Assam and the Central Provinces, and Mr. Bose, the representative of the latter, joined in the prayer. There was not much that was edifying or instructive in the speeches of other members, official and non-official. Thus the speeches of the four popular members, who urged with great ability the popular side of public questions, come out in bold relief. It cannot be said that the Viceroy was quite happy in that part of his speech where he referred to famine. He gave quantities of agricultural statistics to show that during the present drought the peasantry have suffered heavy losses through inadequacy of the crops. This is absolutely correct. In fact, nobody has disputed the fact. It is universally known that the producers in any country where drought prevails suffer from loss of crops. In this respect India is not exceptional. Nor is it pertinent to the question which is now in everybody's mouth—What are the *causes* of famine? We do not need to investigate the effects of famine. Of course, as the President, the Viceroy had the last word. Otherwise it is to be presumed that some of the non-official members would have replied to this observation.

The Financial Statement may, therefore, be relegated to limbo. Let it be buried with its predecessors. will remain unwept and unsung, though some contemporary chroniclers, as already observed, have attempted to do honour to it. There has been no statesmanlike departure. There has been no feature worthy of special notice. There have been "monographs" on half-a-dozen topics on which there is wide difference of opinion. But they neither enliven nor instruct. For that matter they may be called all leather and prunella.

The new Finance Minister has arrived in the country and is to enter on his duties to-day. Sir Edward Law may be a financier, but, like Mr. Clinton Dawkins, he is for India a dark horse. The coming monsoon will try Sir Edward Law's ability. If, unfortunately, it should not be a satisfactory one, as some meteorological prophets predict, he will have a hard time. But let us all hope for the sake of the country, already depressed to the lowest point by plague and famine for four years past, that everything may be satisfactory and the Finance Minister have the opportunity to signalise his first year of office by domestic reforms of a far-reaching character. His first care should be a remission of the enhanced salt duty. It would also be well if the military harpy were muzzled for some years to come, though Sir E. Collen has presented his bill in advance for re-armament and other matters which will have to be taken in hand next year. Military expenditure grows apace and there is no relief. The more we cry out for a reduction the greater is the burden. It was once expected that the Royal Commission would do India financial justice. But all hope is now abandoned, as the reports are that the recommendations of the majority will be colourless and unprofitable. This is India's misfortune. But she has to bear it with patience and resignation till some great statesman is at the helm of affairs and renders her that justice which has been denied her for years past.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

MORE THAN FIVE MILLIONS ON RELIEF.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy on the subject of the famine:—

"Rain has fallen in most Provinces during past week. Effect has not been reported yet, but probably benefit confined to North Punjab and parts Madras. Prices and general conditions same as before. Number of persons in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 1,269,000; Punjab, 194,000; Central Provinces, 1,571,000; Berar, 379,000; Ajmere-Merwara, 122,000; Rajputana States, 460,000; Central India States, 158,000; Bombay Native States, 527,000; Baroda, 70,000; North-Western Provinces, 2,000; Punjab Native States, 21,000; Central Provinces Feudatory States, 56,000; Hyderabad, 304,000; Madras, 12,000; Kashmir, 4,000. Total, 5,149,000."

THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

The Mansion House Fund for the Indian famine sufferers amounted on Wednesday night to £190,000. The Lord Mayor made a further remittance on Wednesday to Lord Curzon of £15,000.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FUND.

We take the following from the current issue (April 14) of the *Investors' Review*:—

Subjoined is the list and amount of subscriptions received for our little fund up to date. May we again repeat that it is a fund every farthing of which will be put to good uses, especially in helping the starved cultivators to replace their lost cattle, and that the more help we can give in this direction the sooner will the distressed provinces and Native States—for they cannot be forgotten in the present misery—recover some of their ancient prosperity? Cheques and postal orders should be drawn to A. J. Wilson, crossed Union Bank of London, Famine Fund Account.

LIST OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

	£	s.	d.
Amount acknowledged last week	£399	14	0
Miss Elsie Shuttleworth (8 years old), Bury (for the children)	1	1	0
Anonymous, London	0	10	0
R. Hope Moncrieff, Esq., London	3	0	0
D. McK., Bath	1	1	0
An Irishman, Dublin	3	0	0
Total to date	£408	6	0

IN THE FAMINE DISTRICTS.

The Special Correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* writes from Ahmednagar on March 27:—

The wages throughout the relief works are paid in money, and they are based on a hypothetical ration of so much grain, salt, vegetables, condiments, and oil, a maximum and a minimum ration being fixed, and the whole adjusted to the price of grain in the bazaar. I shall have more to say later on about the system of work and payment, but it will be seen that the scale works automatically in two important respects. It safeguards the worker against a rise in prices—the price of grain is, roughly, twice as high now as before the famine, but if it were four times as high the food equivalent would still be paid—and it imposes, in theory at least, a certain check upon any tendency to shirk the allotted task. The system is not one of piecework, but task-work with a low minimum and a maximum—the outturn of the gang giving the measure of the individual's wages.

My visit to Uruli happened to fall on a black day, for a week before a circular had been issued decreeing that all gangs performing less than half the maximum task—an imaginary standard, by the way, which no single gang had accomplished during the week in question—should be paid 25 per cent. below the minimum. So that instead of ten and a half annas, the former weekly minimum, the men and women in the defaulting gangs were getting seven and a half and the working children four and a half annas. This is why the group of women at the pay carpet were looking so dejected, why the people kept throwing up their arms or bending low in an attitude of petition as I picked my way between the circles of stone-breakers. "They think you have come to tell them that the wages will not be reduced," a native official explained. Whether the people can subsist on this penal allowance without ripening for cholera and other famine diseases is a question which I hope to discuss in another letter, and a grave question too. Let me only add that this step, which has, I believe, been very generally adopted, has been taken as the result of the circular issued by Mr. Holderness on behalf of the Government of India, and in the full belief that a system of organised shirking, against which the prescribed minimum was of no avail, has been carried on throughout the famine districts. The cry "Ye are idle, ye are idle," comes from almost every English official on famine duty. To which the people reply, "Give us more food, and we will

do more work; this is our third year of famine within four years." It is an ominous fact that whilst the minimum is being cut down by a quarter—a minimum which assumes that only fifteen ounces of solid food a day will go into the stomachs of people who must work nine hours between the rising and the setting of an Indian sun—cholera is on the march in Khandesh, and God help India if cholera attacks the famine camps.

This letter is growing long, and I must cut short what I have to say on the other camps in the Poona district. But concerning the works at Khadkalla, where some four thousand stone-breakers are employed, a word or two may be said which will throw light on the charges of pauperisation with which the Government of India are backing their enforcement of the penal minimum. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that a large percentage of the people are skulking, what evidence have the Government got for the assumption that the villagers are leaving their homes for the works without compunction, and that the old feelings of pride and independence have yielded to the attractions of free quarters and light work? Attractions! Take the life in camp. At three o'clock in the morning the women get up and begin to grind the grain for the midday meal. The refugees have spent the night in the open air—in Poona district no huts are provided for the rank and file—and the morning breeze, as I can testify, blows cold from the Ghauts, cruelly cold for people whose only covering is a threadbare kambli—a word which by courtesy appears to be translated blanket. Then, perhaps, fuel has to be gathered, for it costs an anna a week to buy, or nearly a seventh of the week's wages, and when the bundle of sticks has been collected it is liable to be seized by the officers of the Forest Department. The officials at Khadkalla told me that such seizures had happened several times. When work begins the attractions of stone-breaking, however leisurely performed, are not so obvious. The people are unused to the work, and the stones are hard and difficult to crack. I took the hammer from a little girl who was vainly trying to break a small lump of stone, but after thirty blows, directed, as I thought, with judgment, I gave it up and handed it to the ganger. It took the ganger another dozen strokes to split the stone into two or three bits, and these bits had again to be severally assailed before they would pass through the two-inch ring. But if I am wrong and the life really does attract the people, why have so many of them put off coming? Fifteen hundred fresh arrivals were registered last week at this camp alone, and on the morning of my visit. I found three or four hundred refugees squatted round the office waiting to be admitted. The famine has been going on and camps have been opened in the collectorate for several months. Moreover, the famine code lays it down that the village patel or headman "shall do their utmost to induce distressed villagers to go to relief works," and judging by appearances the new arrivals might well have yielded to the patel's urgency long since. If the people are so demoralised as is alleged, their delay in coming to camp is unaccountable.

Valak and Khamshet villages are close at hand, and the day before my visit to the works I went to inspect them, accompanied by an ex-official who knows the district well. A fair number of the villagers had gone on the works, but most of them I found were still resisting the temptation, preferring to struggle along on wild fruits and whatever they could pick up. Khamshet had come to the end of its beans, and was fairly cleaned out, though not before Government had secured 182 rupees as a first instalment of the land tax—a demand which made a sensible hole in the beans. Valak had paid 125 rupees, and notices for the second instalment had been served on both villages. The people whom I met at this Sunday morning durbar on the spurs of the Ghauts were not at all the whining sort. They answered questions in a straightforward way, through their headman and accountant, and made few complaints. They allowed me to go into their houses—sheds with mud walls, thatched roofs and grass partitions—and see all that was to be seen—a heap of cow dung for fuel and field, two or three brass pots, a stone for rolling chili, a handmill, a quilt of rags for sleeping on, and the spare clothes of the family strung on a line. There may have been food in hiding, but I saw no traces of it in Khamshet, though in Valak a woman was working her mill, and I believe things were slightly better there. I asked about the silver ornaments, but was told that they were all pledged or sold last famine. Two-thirds of the lands of each village was mortgaged, and they would borrow no more. In Valak the money-lender was present on a visit, and he answered for himself. He had come, as it seemed, to look for money, not to lend it, and his grievance, which he let me know before the village, was that he could not recover any part of the two hundred rupees he had lent to the villagers for grain last year. But though the people did not parade their wrongs they let me know two things before I left the villages. The men wanted advances to enable them to prepare their fields in time for the rains, and the women, who kept in the background till we were moving off, would not let us go till the Englishman had seen the blind and the ancient tottering villagers and been asked to consider whether perhaps a little of the grain which the Government allow for village relief might not be spared for them. Of their own hardships on the works and in the village they said nothing. I shall not soon forget this meeting with the villagers who pay us to govern India; the haggard, hunted faces of the women, turned to hideousness by a life of misery; the tottering skeletons of old men; the blind mother with the blind child, and the other child that the two kept fingering; the bright eyes and hard-set faces of the men, and the naked children with distended stomachs and flies at the corners of their eyes; and the bunch of red idol surveying us all through the open door of the temple, under a roof of corrugated iron from Wolverhampton. I asked the headman to tell his people that I had come from England to see them, and that the people of England were sorry for their sufferings. On reflection I admit it seems unreasonable that Khamshet and Valak should not shut their doors and hasten to the works in a body, but the fact is that they are going in driblets, and reluctantly, and when Sunday comes round the exiles hurry back to the poor home and the turned-up field and the red idol as fast as their feet can carry them.

MR. ROMESH DUTT ON OVER-ASSESSMENT AND FAMINES.

The following letter from Mr. Romesh C. Dutt, C.I.E. appeared in the *Times* of April 12:—

Sir,—Returning from India to this country only three days ago, I have read with great interest in the *Times* of this morning the report of the debate which took place in the House of Commons last night on the subject of the Indian Famine. As an Indian myself, I sincerely appreciate the kindly and sympathetic manner in which the speakers dwelt on the subject of the famine in India, and I feel personally grateful to Lord George Hamilton for his lordship's remarks with regard to myself and to the work done by me as a member of the Civil Service of India during over twenty-five years.

Permit me, however, to point out that his lordship is misinformed when he states that the cultivators of Bengal "paid the highest rents of any land occupiers in the whole of India." The fact is just the other way. The cultivators of Bengal, holding lands under private landlords, generally pay the most moderate rents of any land occupiers in British India, and are therefore the most prosperous. And I regret to add that the cultivators of the Deccan, Southern India, and Central Provinces who pay rents to the State, or whose lands are assessed by the State officers, generally pay the highest rents of any land occupiers in British India, and are therefore most indebted, most resourceless, most subject to famine after bad harvests. This, Sir, is a question of fact and not of opinion. I maintain, as I have always maintained, that Bengal cultivators generally pay one-sixth, or less than one-sixth, of the gross produce of their lands as rents to their private landlords; while the rents realised by the Government from Madras cultivators generally exceed one-sixth the gross produce, and often approximate to one-third or more, as I pointed out in the letter which you were good enough to publish in the *Times* of March 24 last. Any enquiry by any officers will disclose this difference; the figures given in Sir W. Hunter's "Statistical Accounts" and "Imperial Gazetteer" about average produce and average rents, district by district, will prove this difference; and this difference explains the comparative prosperity and resourcefulness of the Bengal rayat, and the wretchedness and chronic indebtedness of the Madras rayat. Wipe out the difference, make one-sixth the average gross produce the *maximum* of rent all over India under all forms of land settlements, and you make the cultivators everywhere more resourceful, more prosperous, and more able to help themselves in times of famine.

Permit me also to point out that I have nowhere said that Bengal has altogether escaped famines in this century. As I was myself a famine-relief officer in Bengal in 1874 I could scarcely have made a statement denying the occurrence of famines in Bengal. What I stated was that permanently settled portions of Bengal had escaped such disastrous and severe famines as had afflicted other parts of India. Loss of life was prevented in the Bengal famines of 1874 and 1897; the loss of lives elsewhere in the famines of 1877 and 1897 was estimated by the million.—I am, yours faithfully,

ROMESH DUTT.
(*Late of the Indian Civil Service.*)

41, Gower Street, London,
April 4.

The following further letter from Mr. Dutt appeared in the *Times* of April 18:—

Sir,—In your issue of this morning Mr. C. S. Crole calls into question the statement which I have made that the rent which the zemindars of Bengal generally exact from their tenants is only "one-sixth, or less than one-sixth, of the produce." Will you kindly permit me to mention my grounds for making this statement?

For a period of over twenty-five years, during which I was employed as a Revenue Officer in various districts in Bengal, I took note of the produce of fields and of the rents which the cultivators generally paid to zemindars. I found that the proportion was one-sixth in many districts and less than one-sixth in other districts. I have compared the results of my own enquiries with the figures recorded in Sir William Hunter's "Statistical Account of Bengal," issued in some twenty volumes in 1874 and subsequent years, and these figures confirm my own observations. I give below some figures compiled from Sir W. Hunter's work for some Bengal districts selected at random:—

Districts.	Value of produce per acre in rice and winter crops.	Average rent per acre.	Proportion of rent to produce.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	
24 Perganas	4 7 0	0 13 6	Less than one-sixth
Midnapur	3 15 0	0 9 0	Less than one-eighth
Jessore	3 13 0	0 9 0	Less than one-eighth
Gaya	3 12 0	0 9 0	One-eighth
Noakhali	3 10 0	0 9 0	Less than one-seventh

If the Secretary of State for India has any doubt whatever as to the correctness of my own enquiries, or of the figures given in Sir W. Hunter's work, let an enquiry be made again through the district officers of Bengal. The enquiry will not take many days; every district officer will be able to find out within a week, if he does not know it already, what rents are generally obtained by zemindars for lands of different descriptions in Bengal. And such an enquiry will prove once more the correctness of my assertion, which appears "astounding" to a Madras civilian, that in Bengal the rents which zemindars generally exact from tenants are "one-sixth, or less than one-sixth of the gross produce." And in Northern India the rents generally obtained by landlords from cultivators are one-fifth the gross produce, according to Sir Antony MacDonnell's evidence before the Currency Committee.

My point is this: May we not expect the State landlord in Madras

to deal as leniently and considerately with its tenants as private landlords do in Bengal and Northern India? Will not the Government as landlord fix the same limit on its demands in Madras as private zemindars generally do in practice in Bengal and Northern India? Is not the Government setting a bad example, both to private landlords in British territory and to landlords in Native States, by fixing its *maximum* rental at one-third instead of one-fifth or one-sixth the gross produce?

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

ROMESH DUTT.

(*Late of the Indian Civil Service.*)

41, Gower Street, W.C.
April 17, 1900.

SIR LEPEL GRIFFIN ON FAMINE AND TAXATION.

The following letter from Sir Lepel Griffin appeared in the *Times* of April 11:—

Sir,—The statement of the Secretary of State in the *Times* of yesterday, addressed to the Lord Mayor, on the subject of the Indian famine, should attract serious attention, but I cannot but fear that public charity, so urgently required, may be checked by the too optimistic character of the Indian Budget, as telegraphed to the *Times* and by the speech, last week, of Lord George Hamilton in the debate on the famine. From these it would appear that the financial position of India is satisfactory; that the Government are well able to meet the enormous demand for famine relief without new taxation, and that the only fresh loans proposed are three crores (Rs. 30,000,000) in India and £500,000 in England. The public may thus believe that no special efforts on their part are necessary, an impression which it is most important to remove.

The Indian revenue includes Rs. 15,000,000, which was a tax imposed by Lord Lytton, twenty years ago, to form a reserve for famine relief, and which has been since utilised for such public works as can fairly be supposed to remove or mitigate the effects of famine. The revenue further includes a sum of about Rs. 35,000,000 which was imposed in 1894-95, to meet the loss to the Government on its home charges by the fall in exchange below 1s. 4d. The taxation took the form of import duties on nearly all classes of imported goods, together with countervailing duties on certain classes of cotton manufactured in India. As, for two years past, the exchange has been steady at about 1s. 4d. the Government would have redeemed their pledges and removed this special and temporary taxation, except for the heavy expenditure on the last and present famines. It will thus be seen that the people of India have been paying, for the last two years, no less than Rs. 50,000,000 per annum, or an equivalent in sterling of £6,000,000, for the two years, as special famine taxation, over and above the normal revenue of India. When this important fact is realised and the consequent special heavy burden resting on the people of India, the Indian revenue returns will appear less roseate and the need for English charity and generosity more urgent.

How far famine will affect our future Indian administration is a weighty problem. Shall we, like Frankenstein, be destroyed by the monster we have made? Plague and famine are no more than the automatic efforts of nature to repulse and repress the too abundant population which our civilisation has called into being. The extension of irrigation and cultivation, the enforcement of sanitation and vaccination, the prohibition of widow burning and female infanticide, the cessation of war and rapine have reduced Indian mortality by one-half in fifty years, and the vast population increases more quickly than the increase of food supply in newly-irrigated areas or the food distributing powers of our railways. Are we fighting a hopeless battle? Will the armies of civilisation be broken against the blind, indifferent forces of nature against which it is vain to struggle? This may, and probably will, be the case; but to-day, we have not given up hope of victory and the English people will help, with their utmost generosity, their Indian fellow-subjects in their cruel extremity.—Your obedient servant,

April 10. LEPEL GRIFFIN.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

THE MINORITY REPORT.

The following are the opening paragraphs of the Minority Report, which is signed by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. Dadabhai Naroji, and Mr. W. S. Caine:—

May it please your Majesty,

We, the undersigned Commissioners appointed to enquire into the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure incurred under the authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council or of the Government of India, and the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and India for purposes in which both are interested, being unable to agree in the Report proposed to be submitted to your Majesty by our colleagues in the Commission, desire humbly to submit this our separate Report for your Majesty's consideration.

2. If the enquiry directed by the Commission had not been of the importance which we consider it to be, seeing that it involves the welfare of over two hundred and fifty millions of your Majesty's British Indian subjects, or if the points of difference had been confined to matters of detail and had not extended to matters of principle, we might have felt disposed to acquiesce in the Report proposed by our colleagues. But on careful consideration we regret to find that the differences are important, and in some respects fundamental. We recognise the great ability and experience of public affairs possessed by our colleagues; but we have a duty to discharge and we must attempt to do so to the best of our power.

3. At an early stage of the proceedings of the Commission the differences between our colleagues and ourselves became apparent. As regards Indian expenditure, they seemed to be of opinion that the enquiry directed by your Majesty's Commission was restricted to the mechanical working of the machinery by which civil and military expenditure incurred in India is administered and managed. While, upon the question of the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India, they held that the main duty of the Commission was to see how certain disputes relating to accounts, existing between the War Office and the Admiralty of Great Britain on the one hand and the India Office on the other, could best be settled. We conceive that the reference of the Commission went far beyond this. It will be remembered that when the motion of August 14, 1894 (on the determination of which this Commission was issued), was before the House of Commons, your Majesty's then Secretary of State for India stated in the House that the question which he wished to consider was *whether the Government of India with all its machinery as then existing in India had or had not promoted the general prosperity of the people in its charge, and whether India was better or worse off by being a province of the British Crown.* That, he said, was the test; and these are the broad lines which, as regards expenditure, we consider that our enquiry should follow.

4. The scope of the enquiry as understood by our colleagues did not as it seems to us require that the machinery of a Royal Commission should be resorted to to carry it out. It could have been done by departmental committees, and the enquiry by such means would not have necessitated the examination of witnesses, more particularly the examination of witnesses brought from India at considerable expense.

5. Besides this fundamental difference of opinion between our colleagues on the one hand and ourselves on the other as regards the scope of the enquiry, we are unable to agree with them upon certain of the conclusions which they have arrived at as regards the three sections of the enquiry into which they have divided their Report, viz.: I. Financial machinery, II. Progress of expenditure, III. Apportionment of charge. We propose therefore in this Report to (A) briefly set forth the grounds on which we are unable to accept the conclusions of our colleagues; (B) state generally the principles upon which we think our decisions should be based; and (C) make certain practical recommendations under each of the three sections into which our colleagues have divided their Report.

A.—GROUNDS FOR DIFFERING FROM OUR COLLEAGUES.

I. Machinery of Financial Control.

6. In examining any machinery it is necessary, not only to consider the mechanical working of the several parts, but also to see that the mechanism is well designed as a whole for the purpose in view, and that it is constructed of the proper materials and in such proportions as to produce the best results with the least cost and waste. So also as regards financial machinery. The Report of our colleagues admirably summarises the book-keeping and departmental mechanism; but does not, in our opinion, sufficiently consider whether the public expenditure has been so controlled and guided as to promote in the most effectual way the general prosperity of the people in the charge of the Government of India.

7. Moreover, the Commission has before it valuable materials bearing on these broader considerations. A large amount of important evidence has been recorded on the subject of control over expenditure exercised in the interests of the taxpayers. Upon this point the evidence of the highest authorities, ex-Viceroys and ex-Finance Ministers, was obtained; but afterwards, when the Report came to be considered, and draft clauses were brought forward by one of us (Sir William Wedderburn) to give effect to certain recommendations of the witnesses, our colleagues considered that this all-important branch of the subject was outside the scope of the reference. We maintain that this was an erroneous view of the scope of the reference; for, looking at the Parliamentary debates out of which the Commission originated, it will be seen that no

complaint was made against the book-keeping and departmental mechanism of the Government of India. The complaint was that the expenditure was excessive and ill-directed, and that there exists no effective machinery by which this expenditure is checked or controlled.

II. Progress of Expenditure.

8. As regards this section it appears to us that the conclusions arrived at by our colleagues are in great measure vitiated by certain underlying fallacies. Thus it is stated that the

> growth of expenditure should in the first place be measured against the growth of revenue, that is to say, against the normal increase of revenue independent of changes in taxation;

but it is evident, that a full understanding of the Indian Revenue system is necessary before one can attempt to decide so delicate an economic question as the normal growth of revenue; and by the terms of the reference the Commission was, as we conceive, precluded from making the enquiry necessary to obtain such understanding. An enquiry into the nature of the Revenue system was indeed asked for in the Resolution of August 14, 1894, but this request was distinctly negatived by Sir Henry Fowler, who decided that the reference should be limited to the question of expenditure.

9. If, however, any enquiry into the Revenue system was to be made, that enquiry should have been thorough and complete, to enable the Commission to make it the basis of important conclusions; but the enquiry that was actually made was imperfect and one-sided, for, in spite of emphatic protest, the Commission accepted as conclusive what the official witnesses declared to be the normal increase of revenue, without testing the correctness of their calculations, although these official witnesses were asked by one of us (Mr. Naoroji) to supply certain information by which their statements could be tested, and they failed to do so. It thus resulted that important factors were omitted from the calculations, as, for example, the additional heavy burden which, according to many competent judges, was imposed upon the taxpayers by enhancements of land assessment, by changes in abkâri regulations, and by the closing of the mints, a proceeding which, in a disguised form, increased all taxation by above 30 per cent., this increase being most onerous in the case of land and salt.

10. Again, our colleagues' Report lays down the principle that the growth of expenditure should be

> analysed in its several branches in order to ascertain how far the increase is normal and incurred in order to meet the needs of a civilised and growing community, or how far it is abnormal and due to special causes.

But in dealing with this question sufficient consideration has not been given to the fact that India, being under foreign domination and not a self-governing country, is not in a position to adjust increased expenditure according to increased growth and needs. In the United Kingdom and in every self-governing State or Colony all the resources are at the command of the taxpayers, and the result is a sort of self-acting sliding scale, which regulates expenditure according to the needs and wishes of the people. There exists in such countries a normal economic condition; what is raised from the people returns to the people by the will of the people. But this is quite different in India, where there exists an abnormal economic condition; of what is there raised from the people a large portion does not return to the people. Also the taxpayers have no voice in the expenditure, and the increased expenditure is imposed to meet not so much the growing needs of the country, as the ever increasing drain of remittances to this country. The causes of this increasing drain, and its serious political consequences, were well pointed out by Lord Randolph Churchill as Secretary of State for India, when he said,

> The position of India in relation to taxation and the sources of public revenue is very peculiar, not merely from the habits of the people and their strong aversion to change—which is more especially exhibited to new forms of taxation—but likewise from the character of the government, which is in the hands of foreigners, who hold all the principal administrative offices and form so large a part of the army. The impatience of the new taxation which will have to be borne wholly as a consequence of the foreign rule imposed on the country, and virtually to meet additions to charges arising outside of the country, would constitute a political danger, the real magnitude of which it is to be feared is not at all appreciated by persons who have no knowledge or concern in the government of India, but which those responsible for the government have long regarded as of the most serious order.

11. With pain we must record our concurrence in this view, that the increase of Indian expenditure is a consequence of foreign rule, and is largely to "meet additions to charges arising outside of the country." It is not that domestic needs are few or unimportant. On the contrary, the people of India have many urgent needs, which are clearly stated year by year in the Resolutions passed by the Indian National Congress. For example, they desire the separation of judicial and executive functions; they ask that the police and other subordinate establishments should be adequately paid; they need funds for sanitation and water supply; and they insist that they should have better facilities afforded for all kinds of education. No one denies that these demands are just; but they are resisted on the ground that there are no funds in the hands of the Government with which to give effect to them. On the other hand vast sums are found to meet the wishes of British capitalists for railway extension (*vide* Mr. Naoroji's letter to the Secretary of State, September 13, 1880, App. B., paras. 40, 86, 96). And when on account of special circumstances an increase of establishment is sanctioned, or a new department is created, the principal benefit of that increase too often goes to officials imported into India from this country, and not to your Majesty's Indian subjects. For example, a famine arises; and numbers of Europeans are given employment at high salaries, when respectable Indians could be found to do the work on much smaller salaries and with more sympathy and better knowledge of the people. The plague breaks out, and numbers of doctors and nurses are sent out from this country at great expense, displacing and discouraging the local doctors and nurses who have been bearing the burden and heat of the day.

12. For these and other reasons we consider that the tests applied by our colleagues are fallacious, and that due consideration has not been given to the test laid down by Sir H. Fowler, viz., Whether the result of this increased expenditure has been beneficial or not to the masses of the people.

III. Apportionment of Charge.

13. In certain of our colleagues' recommendations, which we shall afterwards specify, we are glad to be able to concur; but, as already indicated, we find ourselves unable to accept the limited interpretation given by them to the reference, and the method by which the apportionment of charge has been arrived at. With regard to this important difference of opinion, it seems necessary to give our reasons a little more in detail. In the first place the language of the reference seems to us perfectly clear, as including every charge for purposes in which the Governments of the United Kingdom and India are both interested. There is no restriction of any kind, and it appears to us, therefore, that our colleagues have wrongly restricted the scope of the reference, when, with the exception of a part of the establishment of the India Office and some minor charges, they deal only with certain special matters in dispute between the India Office on the one hand, and the War Office and the Admiralty on the other. This error, in our judgment, affects to a large extent the whole of the proceedings of the Commission. At our very first meeting it was suggested by some members that the apportionment clause of the reference had for its object only the settlement of the disputes between these three departments. Against this view Mr. Naoroji, the only Native of India who was a member of the Commission, at once protested, and immediately afterwards, before any witnesses were examined, put in the statement (App. A.) pointing out that according to the terms of the reference, it was necessary to go into the question of the charge for all purposes in which India and the United Kingdom were jointly interested. Some light is thrown upon this point by the proceedings in Parliament out of which the Commission arose. The original Motion was directed generally to an enquiry into the financial relations between India and the United Kingdom, but in order to make the scope of the Motion more clear, Mr. Naoroji on February 12, 1895, moved an amendment to the Address, praying your Gracious Majesty to

> Direct your Majesty's Ministers to so adjust the financial relations between the United Kingdom and British India with regard to all the expenditure incurred in the employment of Europeans in the British Indian services, civil and military, in this country and in India, that some fair and adequate portion of such expenditure should be borne by the British Exchequer.

To this part of the amendment Sir Henry Fowler gave ready assent in his speech, admitting that the subject was one "not undeserving of enquiry," and afterwards adding,

> With reference to the opinion expressed in the Amendment, that a fair and adequate portion of the expenditure should be borne by the British Exchequer, we are quite willing that such an Enquiry should take place and we should be quite satisfied to abide by the result.

Accordingly in the Commission which was afterwards issued there are no restrictions; nor is there any reference to the

particular matters in dispute between the India Office and other departments of the Imperial Government.

14. In passing we may, perhaps, be allowed to say that Sir Henry Fowler, by recommending to your Majesty to grant this Commission, and by laying down a clear, wise and full reference as prayed for, has, according to our view, conferred a substantial benefit upon the Indian people.

15. It was upon this view of the reference that Mr. Naoroji examined the witnesses and gave his own evidence, and also submitted detailed statements dealing with the matter in all its bearings (Appendix A to I), and we confess that it is with regret and surprise that we find our colleagues in their Report have ignored so much that is vital to the Enquiry. But even on their own ground we are bound to point out that a serious fallacy runs through their Report. In dealing with the dispute between the India Office on the one hand and the War Office and the Admiralty on the other, they seem to assume that the Indian Government represents the India of the Indians, as though India were an independent country, having its own resources at its own command, and able to negotiate for its own conditions and terms. Arguments and conclusions based upon such an assumption must necessarily be fallacious. Mr. Gladstone once said,

> It appears to me that to make such a statement that the judgment of the Viceroy is a sufficient expression of that of the people of India is an expression of paradox really surprising and such as is rarely heard among us.

It therefore appears to us that such terms as "Indian interests", and "Indian wants" are sometimes used in our colleagues' Report in a misleading sense. As a matter of fact the dispute above referred to was only between three departments of the Imperial Government, in which the people of India have no voice, the main point in controversy being the payment of the European troops, who, to use the words of the Government of India,

> are maintained for the security of India not against domestic enemies or to prevent the incursions of the warlike peoples of the adjoining countries, but to maintain the supremacy of British power in the East.

It is evident that expenditure of this sort is at least as much a British as an Indian interest.

16. In concluding this portion of the subject we would also submit that our colleagues have hardly given sufficient consideration to the aspects of the case as seen from the Indian point of view. The Commission decided to bring over at the public expense three non-official Indian witnesses from Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, and we recognised with pleasure the steps taken by the authorities in India to secure for this important duty the services of gentlemen well qualified to speak on behalf of Indian public opinion. The fourth Indian witness was sent by a public body in the Deccan, at its own expense; and public meetings in Calcutta and elsewhere deputed a fifth witness to give evidence on the subject of the Indian medical service. Further Mr. Naoroji, who as we have said was the only native of India on the Commission, offered himself as a witness, and placed before the Commission a set of nine documents (Appendix A to I) setting forth in detail the case on behalf of Indians in its several aspects. Finally, evidence of a technical kind was given on behalf of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress by their late secretary, Mr. Morgan-Browne. Each of these seven witnesses before his examination placed in the hands of the Commission a concise written statement embodying the subject matter of his evidence; and upon these statements they were all carefully cross-examined by the Commission, some 3,770 questions being put to them.

17. Without desiring in any way to under-value the evidence of the English officials who were examined before the Commission, we think that very great importance ought to be attached to the evidence of these independent Indian witnesses. They are in touch with the people, and they know the views held by their countrymen generally on the questions before the Commission, and the facts brought forward by them in support of their views are worthy of the most careful consideration. It is to us therefore a matter of deep regret that our colleagues do not seem to have given to this evidence the importance it deserves, their Report containing no reference to the facts and views put forward by Mr. Naoroji and the other Indian witnesses. For it must be borne in mind that however trustworthy high English officials are personally, their opinions are those of a special class, and their information is in great measure derived primarily from ill-paid and untrustworthy subordinates; while the Commission has not been in a position to check or test this official information, as the Government of India has failed to publish facts and figures in the form required by Parliament, and recommended by its own Statistical Committee. For the particulars of these statistics we desire to refer to Appendix C of our Report.

B. General Principles as Basis for Decision.

18. The objects of British rule in India, and the principles according to which it should be administered, have been clearly and repeatedly declared by the highest authorities, both by your Majesty personally, and by British statesmen of foremost rank and distinction. For these declarations the people of India are deeply grateful; and we desire humbly to state our belief that if the principles there laid down are carefully followed the result will be prosperity and contentment in India, with hearty attachment to British rule, and great material benefits to the British people themselves. It is by these principles that we seek to be guided in making our recommendations.

19. First in importance comes your Majesty's gracious Proclamation of 1858, on assuming the direct administration of India. In that Magna Charta of Indian hopes, your Majesty gave the people of India the following assurance:

> When by the blessing of Providence internal tranquillity shall be restored, it is our earnest desire . . . . to administer its government for the benefit of all our subjects resident therein. . . . In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward. And may the God of all power grant unto us, and to those in authority under us, strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people.

Further, your Majesty graciously recognised in your Indian subjects the full rights of citizenship, with a due share in the honours and emoluments of State employment:

> And it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service the duties of which they may be qualified, by their education, ability and integrity, duly to discharge.

The pledges thus given were confirmed on the assumption of the Imperial title in 1877 and at the Jubilee of 1887. Accordingly we conceive that in making our report our specific duty is to consider whether Indian expenditure has been so managed and administered as to fulfil your Majesty's most gracious desire of promoting the prosperity of all your Indian subjects.

20. The primary object desired by your Majesty being to secure the welfare of the whole of the people of India, we propose to cite a few of the leading authorities showing the means by which that object may best be attained. The most salient fact with which we have to deal is the extreme poverty of the masses in India. Sir Evelyn Baring (now Lord Cromer), when Finance Minister of India, said:

> The taxpaying community is exceedingly poor; to derive any large increase from so poor a population as this is obviously impossible, and if it were possible, would be unjustifiable.

Sir Auckland Colvin, another Finance Minister, describes them as men

> whose income at the best is barely sufficient to afford them the sustenance necessary to support life, living as they do upon the barest necessaries of life.

And Sir David Barbour, who also held the same office, has given evidence to the same effect. It seems, however, unnecessary to quote further authorities, as the destitution of the Indian masses is well known, and has become most painfully manifest by their helplessness in the presence of scarcity and famine. They have no store of food, money, or credit. Indeed the great majority have less than nothing, being hopelessly in debt to the moneylenders. We may mention that the extreme poverty of India was brought specially before the India Office so long ago as 1880, when Mr. Naoroji submitted to Lord Hartington the statistics upon which his conclusions were based, and these were analysed by Mr. Danvers on behalf of the India Office. Extracts from this correspondence are given in Appendix B. Such being the condition of the people, it is evident that every effort should be made to secure economy in the expenditure. This is the great central fact which must be constantly kept in view. For as long as it is difficult for the masses to keep alive, all demands for expenditure must be scrutinised with excessive rigour. Also petty savings here and there are useless. What is wanted is a reduction in the general scale of expenditure; and this, fortunately, is possible in at least one direction; because at present so large a portion of the administration is carried on by costly European agency, which might advantageously be replaced by cheap but efficient agency obtained in the country. Such is the view taken by Sir William Hunter, who says:

> You cannot work with imported labour as cheaply as you can with Native labour, and I regard the more extended employment of the Natives not only as an act of justice but as a financial necessity. . . . . If we are to govern the Indian people efficiently and cheaply, we must govern them by means of themselves, and pay for the administration at the market rates of Native labour.

This, in our judgment, is the key to the whole position. The same view was expressed by the Duke of Devonshire, as Secretary of State for India, when he said:

> If the country is to be better governed, that can only be done by the employment of the best and most intelligent of the Natives in the service.

Lord Iddesleigh also, as Secretary of State for India, said:

> If they were to discharge their duty towards India they could only discharge that duty by obtaining the assistance and counsel of all who were great and good in that country. It would be absurd in

them to say that there was not a large fund of statesmanship and ability in the Indian character.

If that large fund of capacity was not properly utilised for employment in the higher grades of the service, Lord Lytton, as Viceroy of India, was of opinion that the fault was ours, for moving in a vicious circle:

> We do not (he said) employ Natives more largely because they are not well qualified, and they are not well qualified because we do not employ them enough.

The employment of Indians in the higher grades has, from 1833, been the subject of legislation and many important debates and despatches; but as these are too voluminous to include in the body of our Report, we have given an historical summary of the question in Appendix F.

21. Now as regards employment in the higher, as well as the lower, grades of the service, the law laid down in the Act of 1833 is that no Indian shall by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, or colour, be disabled from holding any place, office, or employment. And this equality of citizenship was fully affirmed in your Majesty's gracious Proclamation of 1858, when it was declared that merit and capacity were to be the sole qualifications for employment. But we feel it our duty to point out that, while nominally on an equality, Indian subjects of your Majesty are under a great disadvantage in the open competitions through which entry into the higher grades of the service is mainly obtainable. The competitive examinations are held in London, and as they are conducted in English, Indian candidates are severely handicapped by the great distance and by the expense of visiting England, with the added difficulty of the language. The hardship thus inflicted upon young Indians desirous of a career in the service of their own country, was fully admitted by a Committee of five members of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, which in 1860 dealt with this question and emphatically recommended that the competitive examinations should be held simultaneously in India and in England. This was the view taken by the late Lord Derby, and by Mr. Fawcett; and it was approved by the House of Commons, which, by a Resolution passed on June 2, 1893, recommended that

> All open competitive examinations heretofore held in England alone for appointments to the Civil Services of India shall henceforth be held simultaneously both in India and England, such examinations in both countries being identical in their nature, and all who compete being finally classed in one list according to merit.

Unfortunately this Resolution has not hitherto been put in force, and consequently effect has not been given to the principle affirmed by your gracious Majesty that there should be no disqualifications of race or religion, and that employment should be given on the sole ground of merit and qualification.

22. Looking to the interests of the Indian taxpayer there are besides several incidental advantages arising from the employment of Indians in the higher grades of the service. At present the lower grades of the service, in the police and other departments, are filled with an unsatisfactory class of men. This is so because their salaries are insufficient, and because they have no prospect of promotion to the higher grades. If there was this prospect of promotion, a better class of men would enter the subordinate grades, and the taxpayers would get better value for their money. Another incidental advantage to India from a larger employment of Indians in the higher grades is that the salaries and pensions would be spent, or saved, in India, tending thus to the accumulation of capital, instead of draining away in great measure for the benefit of England. But perhaps the greatest advantage from this policy would be found in its influence upon the spirit of the administration. If educated Indians were employed, not only as hewers of wood and drawers of water, but in the higher offices of the State, they would be able, from their intimate knowledge of the people and sympathy with their requirements, to give to the administration that fitness and elasticity, without which it cannot be efficient and economical. For these reasons we place the free employment of Indians in the higher grades, foremost among the measures of reform necessary to make Indian expenditure conformable to the welfare of the masses; while we do not overlook the general benefits which will accrue from associating them in the higher responsibilities of our administration, and making them feel that British rule constitutes a truly national government.

23. The above observations have principally reference to the civil administration. But the same considerations, both of financial economy and political advantage, hold good as regards military expenditure. The courage, discipline, and devotion, of the Indian troops are beyond question, and have received full recognition from the highest military authorities; and we believe that by admitting qualified Indians to the higher ranks of your Majesty's army, attachment to British rule would be fostered among the warlike races of India, while a new element of strength would be added, without increased expense, to the military position. For this purpose Military Colleges would be required in India, where Indians would be trained for a military career as commissioned and non-commissioned officers. A proposal to establish such colleges was, we believe, looked on favourably by his Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught. In this connexion we may state our opinion that certain important advantages would accrue from a shorter term of military service for Indian troops, with the formation of a reserve force, enjoying a small pension. The reservists would feel themselves bound to be (according to Indian parlance) true to your Majesty's salt; and would spread a feeling of loyalty among their surroundings. An easy mode of increasing the numerical strength of the army on occasions of emergency would also be thus provided. We regret that the War Office, by excluding all Indians from Commissions in the British Army, appear to have laid down a rule inconsistent with the Act of 1833, and your Gracious Majesty's Proclamation of 1858. The facts on this point are set forth in Appendix G.

24. From what has been said above it will be seen that the principal means by which, in our opinion, a saving in expenditure may be obtained, is by strictly limiting the employment of costly imported agency, and by freely employing qualified Indians in all branches of their country's service. But in order to scrutinise current expenditure, and steadily enforce economy in the interest of the taxpayer, it is absolutely essential that representatives of the taxpayer should have a fair hearing in the various bodies by which Indian expenditure is directed and controlled. We shall therefore, in our practical recommendations, make certain suggestions for a moderate representation of the people of India, in the Legislative and Executive Councils in India, in the Council of the Secretary of State, and in the House of Commons. These Councils both in India and in England are filled with British officers of experience and distinction. But it is an old and accepted saying that no one knows where the shoe pinches but the wearer. And we are of opinion that these high officials would be much assisted in their responsible duties if they had an opportunity of hearing at first hand the views of an Indian, who naturally would be fully in touch with the people. Even when they held his view of a proposed measure to be mistaken, it would be useful to them to know in what light that measure appeared to the masses of the people whose interests were involved. In urging these concessions we are influenced by a desire to identify Indian interests with those of this country, thereby increasing the strength and solidarity of the Empire.

25. In concluding this part of the subject, as to general principles, we desire to draw special attention to the words of the Marquis of Salisbury regarding the merits of the system followed in well-governed Native States. He said:

> The general concurrence of opinion of those who know India best, is that a number of well-governed Native States are in the highest degree advantageous to the political and moral condition of the people of India.

Similarly Lord Iddesleigh said:

> We should endeavour as far as possible to develop the system of Native government, to bring out Native talent and statesmanship, and to enlist in the cause of government all that is great and good in them.

These were not mere empty expressions of good-will, for in the case of Mysore these two statesmen gave effect to their convictions by restoring that State to Native rule under circumstances which secured the welfare of the people, and formed a bright episode in the history of British rule. (Appendix E.) It is our belief that, in accordance with these views, great benefit would result to British districts if, by a process of decentralisation, they were administered more after the model of a well ordered Native State. The scale of expenditure would be much reduced, while the administration, being relieved from the rigidity of the great centralised departments, would be better able to adapt itself to special local needs and requirements, remaining at the same time under the complete control of the Indian Government.

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Miss Alison Garland, who attended the recent sittings of the Indian National Congress at Lucknow as the delegate of the British Committee, has just returned, and will shortly address a series of meetings upon Indian questions, with special reference to the famine. Meetings have so far been arranged as follows:—

April 26. Exmouth.
May 6. Bolton (Labour Church.)
May 7. Blackburn (W. L. A.)
May 8. Darwen (Liberal League.)
May 20. Rochdale.
May 21. Wigan.

NOW READY.

CONGRESS GREEN BOOK.—No. III.

The Proposed Separation OF Judicial and Executive Duties in India.

MEMORIAL

FROM

RT. HON. LORD HOBHOUSE, K.C.S.I.
(late Legal Member of the Viceroy's Council, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council).

RT. HON. SIR RICHARD GARTH, Q.C.
(late Chief Justice of Bengal).

RT. HON. SIR RICHARD COUCH
(late Chief Justice of Bengal, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council).

SIR CHARLES SARGENT
(late Chief Justice of Bombay.)

SIR WILLIAM MARKBY, K.C.I.E.
(late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta).

SIR JOHN BUDD PHEAR
(late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta, and Chief Justice of Ceylon).

SIR JOHN SCOTT, K.C.M.G.
(late Judge of the High Court, Bombay).

SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.
(late Judge of the High Court, Bombay).

SIR ROLAND K. WILSON, BART.
(late Reader in Indian Law at the University of Cambridge).

MR. HERBERT J. REYNOLDS, C.S.I.
(late Member of the Bengal Legislative Council).

TOGETHER WITH TWO APPENDICES.

LONDON: PUBLISHED BY THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Price One Shilling (or 12 annas), postage 2d. extra.

THE GRANHAMS, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

W. A. DOUGLAS RUDGE, B.A., 1st Class Natural Science Tripos, Scholar and Prizeman of St. John's College, receives gentlemen to prepare for "Little Go," Science Scholarships, and all University Examinations, also in Science for Indian Civil Service. Advice as to College and course of study furnished to gentlemen intending going to Cambridge. References kindly permitted to B. C. Ghose, Esq., B.A., Ghaziaramandi, Lucknow, who will give further particulars.

To Political Associations, Literary Societies, Ethical Societies,

Etc., etc.

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress (84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.), is now making arrangements for lectures and addresses on Indian questions during the Autumn and Winter Season.

Associations or individuals that desire the services of thoroughly competent speakers on Indian questions are requested to communicate as early as may be with the Secretary to the British Committee at the above address.

For a limited number of lectures lantern slides can be provided.

No charge will be made for the services of speakers with whom engagements are made through the British Committee.

Address, THE SECRETARY,
BRITISH COMMITTEE of the
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

TRADE MARK JVARA-HARI

is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I ave much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.